

REMARKS

Please reconsider the claims in the application in view of the remarks below.

Claims 4, 8, 9, 13 – 15 and 17 are canceled, and claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 16 are currently amended. The subject matters of claims 8 and 9 are now presented in claims 1, 12 and 16 as amended to overcome the examiner's rejections by further setting forth on inventive feature of this invention. Support for these amendments can be found at least on page 6, lines 13-18 and on page 7 lines 6 – 24 of the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejected claims 13, 15 and 17 as allegedly directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding to the propriety of the rejection, those claims are being canceled.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102 (Tafoya)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 - 17 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by pending application No. 6,829,607 (Tafoya).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, that is, the cited reference must disclose an identical invention. See, MPEP §2131. With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1, Tafoya allegedly teaches a method for facilitating user input of email addresses by automatically providing dynamically generated completion offer based upon many considerations and their combinations. The method for suggesting of an address in Tafoya is mostly structured around determining the weight, i.e., the highest probability of an address to be used. This weight is determined

by calculations based in most part on the number of days since such address was last used (Tafoya, Page 10, Paragraph 45).

However, in the present application as claimed in the independent claim 1 as amended, there is described a method for deriving a completion string to said input based on a determined score; and offering the derived completion string for completing the address; wherein said score is determined as a combination of base score and context dependent address score; wherein said base score is determined from the content of one or more of: a user's organizational context records, a user's address book, a user's incoming or outgoing mail records, and a user's address records; and, wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of: a user typed address fragments, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communications, and recent completion corrections.

With regard to the rejections of the independent claims 12 and 16, allegedly Tafoya describes a system and apparatus, respectively, for performing the method for facilitating user input of email address by automatically providing dynamically generated address offers based upon many considerations and their combinations. As discussed above, however, the method for facilitating such input is different in the current application in claim 1 as amended, and therefore Tafoya does not teach every element of claims 12 and 16 as amended of the current application.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 claims 4, 8, 9 13 – 15, and 17 are now canceled, Tafoya does not anticipate the remaining claims at least by virtue of their dependency. The examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102 (Plow)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 - 17 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2003/0028792 (Plow).

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 of current application, examiner alleges that Plow teaches the method for completing an address by automatically providing dynamically generated completion offer based upon many considerations and their combinations. The applicants respectfully disagree. It appears to the applicants that Plow discloses a method for automatically inputting user information to an electronic form provided to a user in various e-commerce processes and while filling out on-line applications. (Plow; pages 2 – 4).

To the contrary, in the present application in claim 1 as amended, there is described a method for deriving a completion string to said input based on a determined score; and offering the derived completion string for completing the address; wherein said score is determined as a combination of base score and context dependent address score; wherein said base score is determined from the content of one or more of: a user's organizational context records, a user's address book, a user's incoming or outgoing mail records, and a user's address records; and, wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of: a user typed address fragments, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communications, and recent completion corrections.

With regard to the rejections of the independent claims 12 and 16, allegedly Plow describes a system and apparatus, respectively, for performing the method for facilitating user input of email address by automatically providing dynamically generated address

offers based upon many considerations and their combinations for example while filling out various form within e-commerce processes. As discussed above, however, the method for facilitating such input is different in the current application in claim 1 as amended, and therefore Plow does not teach every element of claims 12 and 16 as amended of the current application.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 claims 4, 8, 9 13 – 15, and 17 are now canceled, Plow does not anticipate the remaining claims at least by virtue of their dependency. The examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102 (Jiang)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 - 17 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2002/0057678 (Jiang).

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 of current application, examiner alleges that Jiang teaches the method for completing an address by automatically providing dynamically generated completion offer based upon many considerations and their combinations. The applicants respectfully disagree. It appears to the applicants that Jiang discloses a method for auto filling a form based on what was previously entered by a user. When applying such method for auto filling an email address field, user preferences and application domain settings are taken into consideration. (Jiang; pages 20, paragraph 300).

In response the applicants respectfully submit that in the present application in claim 1 as amended, there is described a method for deriving a completion string to said input based on a determined score; and offering the derived completion string for

completing the address; wherein said score is determined as a combination of base score and context dependent address score; wherein said base score is determined from the content of one or more of: a user's organizational context records, a user's address book, a user's incoming or outgoing mail records, and a user's address records; and, wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of: a user typed address fragments, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communications, and recent completion corrections.

With regard to the rejections of the independent claims 12 and 16, allegedly Jiang describes a system and apparatus, respectively, for performing the method for facilitating user input of email address by automatically providing dynamically generated address offers based upon many considerations and their combinations, for instance taking into consideration user preferences and application domain settings for determining an email address. As discussed above, however, the method for facilitating such input is different in the current application in claim 1 as amended, and therefore Jiang does not teach every element of claims 12 and 16 as amended of the current application.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 claims 4, 8, 9 13 – 15, and 17 are now canceled, Jiang does not anticipate the remaining claims at least by virtue of their dependency. The examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102 (Cortright)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 - 17 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent 6,895,426 (Cortright).

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 of current application, examiner alleges that Cortright teaches the method for completing an address by automatically providing dynamically generated completion offer based upon many considerations and their combinations. The applicants respectfully disagree. It appears to the applicants that Cortright discloses a method for automatically inputting user information to an electronic form provided to a user in various processes of e-commerce and while filling out on-line applications. (Cortright, col 7).

To the contrary, in the present application in claim 1 as amended, there described a method for deriving a completion string to said input based on a determined score; and offering the derived completion string for completing the address; wherein said score is determined as a combination of base score and context dependent address score; wherein said base score is determined from the content of one or more of: a user's organizational context records, a user's address book, a user's incoming or outgoing mail records, and a user's address records; and, wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of: a user typed address fragments, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communications, and recent completion corrections.

With regard to the rejections of the independent claims 12 and 16, allegedly Cortright describes a system and apparatus, respectively, for performing the method for facilitating user input of email address in various e-commerce processes by automatically providing dynamically generated address offers based upon many considerations and their combinations. As discussed above, however, the method for facilitating such input is different in the current application in claim 1 as amended, and therefore Cortright does not teach every element of claims 12 and 16 as amended of the current application.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 claims 4, 8, 9 13 – 15, and 17 are now canceled, Cortright does not anticipate the remaining claims at least by virtue of their dependency. The examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

New Claims 18-20 are being submitted that are respectively dependent upon Claims 1, 12 and 16 to set forth the manner in which the claimed base score is updated. Particularly, Claims 18-20 cover the updating methodology as taught in the present specification (e.g., see page 10, line 15-25 description of the updated algorithm comprising a linear combination function). Thus, respectfully, no new matter is being entered.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that he call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman

Registration No.: 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy, & Presser PC
400 Garden City Plaza-Suite 300
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:GS:tb
Encl.: Replacement Drawing Sheet